



United States
Office of Personnel Management

DIGEST OF SIGNIFICANT CLASSIFICATION DECISIONS AND OPINIONS

No. 8
April 1986
AR-100

Office of Merit Systems
Oversight & Effectiveness
December 1997, HRCD-4

[Main Menu](#) [Help Screen](#)

Note to Readers

The guidance in this issue is still applicable and useful in classifying positions in the Federal government. However, there may be references to names and addresses of organizations within the U.S. Office of Personnel Management that have changed, names of individuals no longer employed at the Office of Personnel Management, or documents such as the Federal Personnel Manual that no longer exist.

For the December 1997 HRCD-4 release, the Office of Classification Appeals and Fair Labor Standards Act Programs made minor, nonsubstantive edits to Digest issues 1 through 19. For example, acronyms and abbreviations were spelled out in many places, references to law and regulation were expanded, typographical errors were corrected, leading zeros were added to 3-digit series numbers, outdated prefaces have been deleted, and the issuance date were added to the header of each page. Because of the change from the original paper version to an electronic format, the page numbers in Digest issues 1 through 19 and other references, such as the General Schedule classification standards and Federal Wage System job grading standards, now available electronically may have changed. In issues 1 through 19, where there is a reference to a page, we either eliminated the page reference or updated the page number with the page number of the electronic version. Beginning with issue 20, pages references are to the electronic version only. Please note that pages numbers may change when a file is printed depending on the format and printer used.

The Office of Classification Appeals and Fair Labor Standards Act Programs is responsible for the content of the Digest. We be reached by telephone at 202-606-2990, by fax at 202-606-2663, or by email at ADOMSOE@OPM.GOV.

Digest issues are also available on the Office of Personnel Management's website and electronic bulletin board. The website address is <http://www.opm.gov> and the electronic bulletin board is OPM ONLINE. Using a modem, dial OPM ONLINE at 202-606-4800. Long distance telephone charges may apply.

Standard: Job Grading Standard for Supervisors (WS)
(June 1970)

Factor: Nature of supervisory responsibility

Issue: Foreman credit when supervisor is in General
Schedule

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in the adjudication of an appeal from a wage grade supervisor. The position's principal assignment was to supervise workers on a shift responsible for the operation and maintenance of a power plant. The position was under the supervision of a General Schedule Facility Manager rather than a Wage Grade Foreman. The appellant contended that his position should be credited with being a full Foreman because his supervisor was not technically qualified to supervise his work.

Resolution

The Office of Personnel Management determined that the General Schedule Facility Manager had responsibility for performing duties that properly fall within the Foreman range of responsibility. For example, he was responsible for all power plant operations and for such matters as planning and scheduling maintenance, establishing priorities, developing short- and long-range requirements, assigning work assignments to the shift Foremen, and for assigning subordinate personnel. Consequently, the extent of the appellant's planning responsibilities was constrained by the planning done by his General Schedule supervisor. The Office of Personnel Management also noted that it would not be possible for each of the five shift Foremen to have the full range of planning responsibility for the work done by and through all of the other Foremen. Therefore, it was concluded that the range of the appellant's Foreman responsibilities was less than full, thereby affecting the final grade determination.

Although the higher management official's position was in the General Schedule, his responsibilities corresponded to Foreman and had a constraining influence on the WG Foreman's position.

Standard: Job Grading Standard for Supervisors (WS)
(June 1970)

Factor: Level of Work Supervised

Issue: Determination of grade level supervised

Identification of the Classification Issue

The issue arose in the consideration of an appeal concerning the job of Automotive Worker Foreman. The appellant supervised five subordinates performing work at the WG-08 level, and personally performed nonsupervisory work at the WG-10 journeyman level. The appellant requested that he be credited with supervising WG-10 work based on the highest level of the shop's completed repair work.

Resolution

The Office of Personnel Management decided that the supervisor's personally performed nonsupervisory WG-10 journeyman level work could be used only to evaluate the *nonsupervisory* part of his job. However, it could not properly be used to determine the level of work that he *supervised*.

The supervisory job grading factor, Level of Work Supervised, is intended to measure the level and complexity of the work operations supervised and its effect on the difficulty and responsibility of supervision. This level is usually the grade of the highest level nonsupervisory employees who are supervised. In certain very unusual situations, the difficulty and complexity of the overall work operations supervised are not accurately reflected in the grades of any of the subordinate jobs. In these situations, the level supervised may be determined by constructing a grade reflecting the work product produced with prominent subordinate staff involvement. However, in this appeal case, the subordinate staff was not prominently involved in the work of the shop above the WG-08 level. Therefore, the constructed grade approach did not justify use of WG-10 as the level supervised.

The appellant's job was classified as Automotive Worker Foreman, WS-5823-08, which represented a higher pay rate than the nonsupervisory full performance WG-10 work that he personally performed.

Standard: General Attorney, GS-0905
(October 1959)

Factor: N/A

Issue: Series and grade determination for a position
requiring qualifications for a small part of the
job

**This article was deleted in December 1990
because of the issuance of the revised
Introduction to the Position Classification
Standards.**

Standard: Two-grade Interval Standards

Factor: N/A

Issue: Use of two-grade interval standards to evaluate one-grade interval work

Identification of the Classification Issue

The issue arose in a position classification appeal decided by Office of Personnel Management. The appellant performed a variety of administrative support duties which did not require an intensive knowledge and understanding of management principles, practices, methods, concepts and techniques, or other similar and related skills and knowledges which typify positions that are properly covered by standards developed to cover two-grade interval work, e.g., GS-0343, Management Analysis Series.

The agency had applied the GS-7 grade-level criteria of the GS-0343 standard to determine the grade of the position. The issue for the Office of Personnel Management was whether such application is appropriate in the evaluation of one-grade interval administrative support work.

Resolution

There is a significant variance between the qualifications required for one-grade interval work and those required for trainee and developmental two-grade interval work. Two-grade interval criteria are predicated on possession of the knowledges, skills, and abilities required to accomplish two-grade interval work. Therefore, use of two-grade interval criteria requires making adjustments to accommodate the differences in the nature of the work and related knowledges, skills, and abilities of the positions intended for coverage, compared to the position being evaluated. There is no clearly applicable adjustment procedure whereby two-grade interval criteria can be applied under these circumstances.

In this particular case, as the issue involved the agency's use of GS-0343 grade-level criteria at the GS-7 level, it involved the use of criteria designed for a two-grade interval developmental assignment. The typical assignments included in such criteria reflect a temporary stage of development toward work of a more judgmental and analytical nature. As these criteria were not intended to be used to evaluate one-grade interval work, the purpose of the assignments, the work situations described, and the criteria for knowledges, skills, controls over work, guidelines, work complexity, etc., do not reasonably parallel one-grade interval work. Therefore, it is inappropriate to evaluate full performance level one-grade interval work by comparison with trainee and developmental criteria from a two-grade interval standard.

It was determined that the appellant's paramount duties and responsibilities were best evaluated by the use of the one-grade interval standard for the Management Clerical and Assistance Series, GS-0344.

Standards: Police Series, GS-0083 (August 1974) and
Guard Series, GS-0085 (June 1968)

Factor: Series selection

Issue: Intended use of Police Series, GS-0083, vs.
Guard Series, GS-0085

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in a position classification appeal decided by Office of Personnel Management. The appellant worked for an agency that had determined that his position was properly placed in the Guard Series, GS-0085, because his primary function was to protect Government property. The appellant had arrest authority consistent with that of a private citizen and he was not considered a "peace officer." However, he received specialized training relating to both law enforcement and to security topics. The appellant's position was located at a large installation which led to the performance of police-type duties in connection with the safeguard of government materials.

Resolution

The Office of Personnel Management recognized that the distinction between guard and police work is sometimes difficult to make. Both guards and police officers wear uniforms, display badges of authority, and carry sidearms. Both are organized along military lines. Both may serve in stationary posts or patrol either on foot or in a vehicle.

Despite the similarities, there are four indicators which can be used to determine the proper series. The first indicator is the *basic mission* of the organization. Guard organizations are established primarily to protect Government property, and secondarily, to protect persons in and around the property. Police organizations primarily exist to enforce law and order, preserve peace, and protect life and civil rights; and secondarily, to protect property.

The second indicator is the *arrest authority*. Police officers are designated by public law, statute, or other official act, as agency or local enforcement officers. They enforce a wide variety of Federal, State, county, or local laws. Guards, however, usually have arrest authority consistent with that of a private citizen. In some cases, they may have the same power as sheriffs and constables.

The third indicator is *training*. The primary emphasis of police training is the techniques, methods, and principles of law enforcement work. Stress is placed on preservation of law and order, protection of human life and civil rights, court procedures, crowd control, accident

investigation, and arrest procedures. The primary emphasis for guard training is on the principles, methods, and techniques involved in protecting Government property. Stress may be placed on methods for detecting efforts to breach a security system and means for preventing espionage and sabotage. Guards who exercise police-type authority may receive advanced training in arrest procedures, investigation procedures, crowd control or riot procedures, rights of suspects, and any other specialized training related to their assignments.

The fourth indicator is *patterns of work*. Essentially, guards are oriented toward protection of property; police officers are oriented toward maintaining law and order. However, the orientation of guard positions located at large installations tends to broaden to encompass and include a law enforcement emphasis. This is particularly true in those situations in which the guard organization is not only responsible for protection of valuable property, but also for control of large acreage containing various facilities. Typically, such an installation is populated by large numbers of persons and vehicles necessitating a law enforcement effort to some degree.

Generally, positions are classifiable to the police occupation when the four indicators reflect a definite and positive police orientation in all of the posts to which the employee is regularly assigned. In this particular case, although the employee performed a mixture of guard and police-type duties, and received training for both, this combination is typical for guard positions at large installations. The basic mission of the appellant's organization was to protect Government property. The arrest authority did not match that of police officers. The Office of Personnel Management concluded that the position was properly classified in the GS-0085 Guard series because a definite and positive police orientation did not exist in the four indicators.

Standard: Aircraft Operation Series, GS-2181
(December 1967) and Education Group

Factor: Series coverage

Issue: Intended use of Aircraft Operation Series,
GS-2181, vs. the Education Group Series

**This article was deleted in September 1988
because the new GS-2181 series, dated
January 1988, clarified the issue discussed
in this article.**
